

REMARKS

First, it is noted that in the claims the term “controller” has been replaced by “coordination module.” As disclosed at Applicants’ Substitute Specification, page 6, the paragraph beginning at line 4, the error messages from the individual monitoring units are sent to the coordination module CM which collects these transmitted error messages and implements an evaluation of these error messages. As disclosed at page 7, line 30, the coordination module CM evaluates the error and determines at least one error type. See also page 8 beginning at line 14 where the error states transmitted to the coordination module CM are stored and compared with predetermined error patterns so that a positive error is thereby determined. The error patterns contain one or more error states.

Further note that as disclosed at Substitute Specification page 6, lines 4-15, that the monitoring units which transmit the error messages are located in separate device components of the printer or copier such as the image recording unit PU and the paper controller 14 which transmit error messages to the communication module CM. Further monitoring units transmit error messages where the monitoring units are contained in a plurality of device components such as a paper input unit, a paper output unit, a stack unit, etc. Thus the respective monitoring units are located in respective different device components of the printer or copier.

Claim 27 has been amended to bring out these additional features.

The Examiner rejected claims 27-31, 33-34, 36 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by newly cited Schroath. Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Schroath further combined with Chiba. Claims 35 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Schroath further in view of Parry.

Claim 27 as amended clearly distinguishes over Schroath alone or in combination with any of the secondary references, at least by reciting of a plurality of separate monitoring units each located in a different device component of the printer or copier, and wherein a plurality of respective temporarily successive error states based on respective error signals are sent from respective monitoring units of the printer or copier created by a single causative error. The Examiner relies on paragraph 28 of Schroath together with Figure 3 for detecting multiple errors. However, there is only one error identification module 212 which is identifying a same error as occurring two times within x minutes. See also paragraph 26 where the printer has an error identification module 212 which identifies print errors. This same error indication from the error identification module 212 is sent to the error analysis module 216. But there are no plurality of separate monitoring units each located in a different device component of the printer or copier generating a plurality of error signals identifying corresponding error states created by a single causative error and where these are all transmitted to a coordination module. Schroath is only sending a same error indication from a single error identification module 212 at only one part of the printer – namely a module identifying printer errors.

Claim 27 next distinguishes by reciting that the coordination module compares the stored plurality of temporally successive error states (from the separate monitoring units in the different device components) with predetermined error state patterns, each pattern defining a sequence of error states. For this the Examiner relies on paragraph 27 and 28 of Schroath describing whether a same error has occurred t times within the last x minutes and if the same error occurs a particular number of times t within a predetermined time period of x minutes, the error is likely to be a problem with the printer rather than a problem with a particular print job. But

such an error sequence with the same error which is reoccurring within a time period is completely different than claim 27 where the successive error states are from different parts of the printer or copier (and thus not the same error state) and there is also no sequence of error states which are being compared at paragraph 27 or 28 of Schroath where those successive error states are from respective different device components of the printer. Thus claim 27 readily distinguishes in at least two different ways.


Dependent claims 28-37 distinguish at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 27 and also by reciting additional features not suggested.

Independent claim 38 distinguishes in a manner similar to claim 27.

Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to account No. 501519.

Respectfully submitted,


(Reg.No.27,841)
Brett A. Valiquet
Schiff Hardin LLP
Patent Department
6600 Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 258-5786
Attorneys for Applicants.
CUSTOMER NO. 26574